

Giles (A.E.)

THE  
INIQUITY OF  
COMPULSORY VACCINATION,  
AND THE  
UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF ITS STATUTES.

BY ALFRED E. GILES.

"Now, truth, perform thine office; waft aside  
The curtain drawn by prejudice and pride;  
Reveal to wondering eyes  
This more than monster in his proper guise."—*Cooper.*

The life of the flesh is in the blood.—*Leviticus XVII., II.*

"Parents often find some one of their children tainted with morbid humors, unlike any other member of the family, and which they are wholly unable to account for, except on the supposition of foul matter taken into the system by vaccination.—*R. T. Trall, M. D., New York.*

HYDE PARK, MASS. :  
PRESS OF THE NORFOLK COUNTY GAZETTE.

1882.



# PREFATORY.

---

THE writer published in THE NORFOLK COUNTY GAZETTE of 29th of last October, a short article, entitled *The Vaccination Delusion*, wherein, together with his own arguments, he employed certain others, previously used by Mr. Henry Bergh, (the well-known chief officer of The New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals,) in his letter in the BOSTON POST of October 24th. The following week's GAZETTE,—that of November 5th, contained an article, entitled *The Utility of Vaccination*, over the signature of Dr. W. S. Everett, a highly esteemed physician of Hyde Park. A reply to it appeared in the next issue of the GAZETTE, November 12th, which with some revision is herein published, in the hope that by reaching other circles of readers, it may aid towards the speedy repeal of those insidious ruthless iniquities—the Massachusetts *Compulsory Vaccination Statutes*,—which, in scriptural phrase, *frame mischief by a law*.

A. E. G.

HYDE PARK, MASS., November 16, 1881.

*In the hope of your kind co-operation for the repeal,  
or other annulment of the **compulsive**-vaccination Statutes,  
thus leaving it to the option of every citizen to be vaccin-  
ated, or not vaccinated, as he may choose.*

*With the respects of*

*THE AUTHOR.*





# THE INIQUITY OF COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

*"For the mystery of iniquity doth already work."*

A REPLY TO DR. W. S. EVERETT'S "UTILITY OF VACCINATION."

*Revised and reprinted from the Norfolk County Gazette of Nov. 12, 1881.*

*Editor of the Norfolk County Gazette.*—On the first day of the battle of Chickamauga, September 19, 1863, a well and hearty soldier of the Union army, eighteen years of age, was captured by the Confederates, and afterwards taken with about five thousand other prisoners to Richmond, Va. Subsequently, about November, he, with other captives, was removed to Danville, Va., where they remained until the following spring. He relates his experience while there substantially as follows:—

"During the time we were at Danville we suffered considerably from cold and close confinement. The small-pox also broke out among us, and attacked a good many, but in most cases in a mild form. Those afflicted had it as violently as could be expected under the circumstances, their systems being in such a depleted condition that the disease had nothing to feed on. In fear of it, and to prevent it, many were vaccinated. I was not—and I thank Providence that I was not—as I knew some to suffer worse from vaccination than they would have done from the small-pox, even though it terminated fatally; for it did terminate fatally in the cases of vaccination, and after more suffering than could possibly have ensued from the dreaded disease itself. The vaccine virus proved to be poisonous in some cases. I knew a man whose left arm was eaten to the bone by it, the bone

being visible, and the cavity, which was circular in shape, was as large in circumference as an ordinary orange. After months of excruciating pain the man died.

"But sometimes the vaccination did not even prevent the small-pox. A man with whom I bunked was vaccinated, and it "took" what would be considered immensely well, a very large scab developing upon each arm. Yet this man took the small-pox, and badly, while I—to take another view of the case,—although I had not been vaccinated for about thirteen years, and yet had been exposed to the disease in almost every way, and had slept with this man while he was taking it, and after he returned from the small-pox hospital with his sores but partially healed up, remained perfectly free of it. I thought if I must have it, I must, and there was an end of the matter, there being no way of avoiding it that I could see; and I do not know but the late vaccination, while the disease was already thickly scattered about the house, increased the danger of contagion, by throwing the blood into a fever of the same kind; while by leaving the blood undisturbed, if the disease was not intercepted, the chances of taking it were at least not augmented."

The above writer was subsequently removed to Andersonville, where he contracted diseases which caused him much suffering after his release and return home. At last a physician in the town where he resided, and who for six months had been endeavoring to get his consent to allow him to treat his case, induced him to place

himself under his permanent care. This physician gave him morphia and other preparations of opium, which so injured the patient that, in his detestation of that drug, and as a warning to other people, he wrote an autobiographical sketch entitled *Opium Eating*, published by Claxton, Remsen & Haffeldinger in Philadelphia in 1876, from whose pages, 15-17, the preceding extracts are made.

This sketch, which accidentally came to hand just before I read the learned article of our esteemed townsman, Dr. W. S. Everett, in last week's *GAZETTE*, on "The Utility of Vaccination," contains some pertinent facts for consideration. Small-pox, as the doctor shows, is a destructive disease. In the times and places to which he refers, its ravages were great, and were probably increased, among other causes, by the unhygienic medical treatment under which its victims suffered. But though small-pox be a dangerous disease, *compulsory vaccination does not prevent nor cure it*. In my younger days I believed in the efficacy of vaccination; I had been told by respected friends and physicians that it was useful; and I had not heard it questioned; but subsequent experiences and wider observations have destroyed my confidence in it. Though I do not oppose voluntary vaccination, and observe with interest the results of that practice, yet I do detest all methods and statutes for *enforcing* vaccination on unwilling people. Here in Massachusetts, whose Constitution guarantees to every individual the enjoyment in safety and tranquility of his *natural rights*, the existing statutes\* require parents to cause their children—each one before it attain the age of two years—to be vaccinated, and prohibit their admission to the public schools until that surgical operation has been performed. It matters not that the child is as healthy a one as ever was born on this planet, that its breath is sweeter than roses, and its blood purer than the crystal river of the water of life, the Massachusetts statutes require that its parents shall cause the virus—the pus of a gangrenous sore in a diseased beast—to be injected into the veins of that innocent, loving and lovable

child, before it attain the age of two years, and afterwards, that it shall not be admitted into the public schools, which its parents are taxed to support, until the wicked, insidious and dangerous operation has been performed.

It was once believed that a man's house was his castle, his place of refuge from all enemies; but the Vaccination Statutes require a man to admit the loathsome gangrene of the vaccinator into the veins and tissues of his body, the house he lives in, into the very citadel of his life. Its medical advocates, many of whom are mere hum-drum routine practitioners, looking to vaccination fees as one source of professional income, insist that vaccination is not injurious. But other intelligent physicians—keen observers—testify that though often its subjects have sufficient constitutional vigor to throw off its noxious influences, yet not unfrequently it produces dangerous, and even fatal results. Dr. J. A. M. Munn, in his letter published at the *Belfast* (Ireland) *Evening Telegraph* of 27th of last May, says: "The propagation of syphilis, scrofula, cutaneous diseases and a host of hereditary maladies, is fairly attributable to vaccination, and in many instances have been directly traced to it. I have observed," he writes, "four cases myself in which the connection was unmistakable, and many others in which it was more or less obscure. There is no method, either chemical or microscopical, of ascertaining with any degree of certainty the purity or impurity of so-called lymph; consequently in any given case we are utterly unable to describe its results."

Dr. William Hitchman, an eminent physician in Liverpool, with whom I became personally acquainted while there, informed me that his experience as a public vaccinator, and in private practice, had made known to him an increasing number of fatal cases of small-pox after vaccination from 1841 to 1871 inclusive; and that, on the other hand, during the whole of that time small-pox had annually appeared year after year without previous vaccination under his own personal supervision, with no fatal result, and not unfrequently with no serious nor protracted impairment of health.

The last August number of the *Vaccination Inquirer and Health Review* (a very valuable magazine for all who wish to become acquainted with both sides of the Vaccination Question; it is published by E. W. Allen, 4 Ave Maria Lane, Paternoster Row, London,) gives the particulars of the vaccination of a company of French soldiers

\* The General Statutes, Chapter 26, Section 27 require that children be vaccinated before they attain the age of two years. Chapter 41, Section 8, prohibits the admission of any child to the public schools, who has not been duly vaccinated.



last December. Fifty-eight of them were vaccinated by the regimental doctor from a Spanish child. In a few days the whole of the fifty-eight, *without exception*, were infected with syphilis.

G. S. Gibbs, Esq., F.S. S., has calculated that in addition to the deaths of over 300 children, per annum, under one year of age, of Syphilis, in London, there are 800 afflicted with this disease, who survive, and who, on being vaccinated, furnish impure lymph for the life-long contamination of thousands of helpless and innocent babies.

In the Annual Report of the Massachusetts Board of Health for the year 1874, pp. 542-5, may be read some account of the diffusion of small-pox by the vaccinations of one of the doctors in the town of Spencer, in this State. Some cases of small-pox having there appeared, the compulsory vaccination law was invoked, the inhabitants were alarmed, and, as a consequence, to save themselves from the law and their children from small-pox, they sent for the doctors to vaccinate them. Now to state the matter exactly in the briefest possible terms—for the State officials made as short work in their report of it, as possible—I will here quote its words as follows:

"52 children had virus inserted in their arms by Dr. Fontaine. Within 14 days after this operation these children entered the hospital, in the eruptive stage of small-pox. At the examination before the grand jury concerning the charge of manslaughter, based on the death from small-pox, of one of the children alleged to have been inoculated, no witness testified to the fact that small-pox virus was taken and used, although there were plenty who felt convinced that such was the case. Dr. Fontaine denied the charge."

How does the reader regard this sickening record? Who was responsible for the diffusion of small-pox in Spencer? Alas! for the sad parents whose children were there sacrificed on the Molech altar of compulsory vaccination.

"A voice was heard in Ramah,  
Weeping and great mourning,  
Rachel weeping for her children;  
And she would not be comforted."

Other cases showing the sad results of vaccination could be adduced, sufficient to fill all the columns of the GAZETTE; but probably enough have been given to satisfy the candid reader. Dr. Everett shows that small-pox was a very destructive disease prior to the discovery of vaccination. So also was the plague, and there are times

and places now-a-days when cholera and yellow fever are very destructive, and number their victims by the tens of thousands. These maladies—epidemics, as they are named,—appear whenever and wherever the unwholesome conditions of human life necessitate their existence. But Dr. Everett endeavors to show that since vaccination was introduced the mortality from small-pox has much diminished; and therefore he infers that that diminution of mortality has been caused by vaccination. Just here is where the opponents of vaccination take issue with him. They believe that the diminution of the small-pox mortality arises from better modes of living, and is a necessary consequence of improved sanitary conditions of life among people. The plague—the black death of the Middle Ages—has not appeared in Western Europe nor in the United States since the introduction of vaccination, but its absence has not been owing to the practice of vaccination, but rather to the disuse and the banishment of the unwholesome conditions of life which are necessary to develop it.

When General B. F. Butler was in command at New Orleans, many people believed that a pestilence would there appear, but he sagaciously forestalled the epidemic by substituting throughout that metropolis sanitary sewerage and cleanliness in lieu of filth and pestilential conditions of life. The same principle explains the comparative exemption of Europe and America during the present century, from the ravages of small-pox. Right sanitary and hygienic conditions of life, wholesome regimen, cleanliness, sobriety, temperance, and a good conscience, not simply vaccination alone, will save people from the plague, from small-pox, from yellow fever, from cholera, and from all other epidemics. There is no other royal road than this, to the acquirement of, and preservation of good bodily health.

As to the small-pox statistics figured out by the medical officer of the London Local Government Board, which Dr. Everett prints, I attach little or no value to them as affecting the main question. They are illustrations of the arrangements and cookery, to which statistics can be subjected. In my article, "The Vaccination Delusion," published in the GAZETTE of October 29th, appeared certain statistics, given by the Registrar-general of London in relation to the mortality from small-pox during the last thirty years within that metropolis, which statistics, Mr. Henry Bergh, the well-known chief officer of the New York

Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, had accepted, and argued from as follows:—

"Decades. Estimated Popu'n.	Small-pox Deaths.
1851-60	2,570,489 7,150
1861-70	3,018,193 8,347
1871-80	3,466,486 15,543

"It seems to me," said Mr. Bergh, "that it is absurd in the face of these returns, to say that vaccination has 'deadened the flame' or saved the lives of thousands, as is erroneously supposed, or that the deaths accrue from the 'unvaccinated residuum,' as many believe, seeing, that in the first decade, when few comparatively, were vaccinated, the mortality was not half as great as in the last, when 85 per cent. of the infant population had received the benefit of the state endowed prophylactic.

"These facts, coupled with the additional one that during the twenty-six weeks ending July 2, 1865 persons died in that city of small-pox, 422 of whom were under 5 years of age, show an enormous increase of small-pox, and are, utterly subversive of the claims of vaccination and call loudly for a repeal of the despotic laws, wherever they exist, of compulsory vaccination.

"Again, the advocates of that system take no notice of the improved sanitary condition of the civilized world in their flattering exhibits, but boldly credit vaccination with all they see or rather think they see.

"As I had the honor to state," continued Mr. Bergh, "at a public meeting in Tremont Temple the other evening, the opinion is fast gaining ground that to the illogical and fatal practice of impregnating a healthy body with the foul mucus of a diseased animal is to be attributed those terrible scourges of the human race, to wit:—Consumption, scrofula, cancer and the like, which sweep away so many millions of mankind, annually, from the face of the earth."

Do these statistics have any influence with Dr. Everett? No! Ignoring the fact that vaccination was made compulsory by an act of Parliament in the year 1853, and again in 1867, and yet more stringent in 1871, and that therefore, probably many, if not the greater part, or all of the above small-pox victims had been vaccinated, Dr. Everett dismisses the preceding statistics with the remark that Mr. Bergh,—

"Is overwhelmed with disappointment and horror and astonishment because thirty-one thousand and forty deaths have occurred in thirty years, in an estimated population varying from two and one-half to three and one-half millions of people; and we are therefore gravely informed that vaccination is a failure and a delusion, when there is no reason to suppose that it is known whether a single individual of this thirty-one thousand had been vaccinated, or whether they had not. There is no need to say more."

Thus it appears that from the same statistics Mr. Bergh and Dr. Everett drew different conclusions, each according to his capability of correct perception. The reader can judge for himself.

Dr. Everett next pleads that those persons who "know nothing better" than vaccination as a preventive to small-pox

should "be permitted to repose with what degree of confidence" they can, upon it. Certainly! that privilege, or, rather, personal right,—for it is a matter of private judgment pertaining strictly to themselves—doubtless all anti-vaccinators will readily acknowledge. The vaccinators may even go further, if they wish to. They may vaccinate and re-vaccinate, inoculate and re-inoculate themselves daily, and as much oftener as they please, and with every variety of lymph, vaccine and bovine, humanized, bestial, or fishy—that they can obtain, and I know of no one who will oppose them in thus manifesting their appreciation of Dr. Jenner's alleged great discovery.

But will Dr. Everett reciprocate this tolerance, this liberality of living and practice, to anti-vaccinators? Will he favor the admission into the public schools of their perfectly healthy children, innocent of all vaccine lymph infused into their veins? Ah! No! He has already intimated, in his learned article, that their "presence is contamination" and their "contact shall be death." But here I would ask to whom is their presence contamination, and their contact death? Is it to the vaccinated children, side-by-side with whom they sit? BUT IF VACCINATED, (and Dr. Everett affirms that vaccination "is the only protection we have") HOW CAN SUCH CHILDREN BE CONTAMINATED, OR DEATH-STRICKEN BY SMALL-POX, FROM WHICH THEY ARE ALREADY SHIELDED BY THEIR VACCINATION? A MAN CLAD IN BULLET-PROOF ARMOR, DOES NOT MAKE HIMSELF ONE WHIT MORE SECURE BY COMPELLING HIS NEIGHBORS ALSO TO WEAR ARMOR. Evidently Dr. Everett distrusts the efficacy of vaccination in protecting the vaccinated children; and, if he distrusts it, it is monstrous tyranny on his part to force it upon unwilling people, who are as citizens no less good and intelligent than he is himself.

But let us see what physicians and other persons, who have studied the subject as much as Dr. Everett has, and perhaps more so, have said respecting it; and as Dr. Everett is not averse to statistics, a Fellow of the English Social Science Society. John Pickering, may here first express his opinion, not unlikely matured by his statistical studies, as follows:

"Vaccination is a folly and a crime; it is not a prophylactic against small-pox, but, on the contrary, produces it; and, in addition, it is a fearful engine of death, by communicating, along with the vaccine virus, other diseases, all equally lethal, and which are yearly on the increase."



Next let Francis W. Newman, Emeritus Professor, Oxford University, speak. He says: "The doctors who advise vaccination have no right to be listened to with deference; for they have been guilty of monstrous and deadly blunders. A quarter of a century back they rebuked and scoffed at those—some of the graduates in medicine—who informed them that vaccination *may* propagate, and *has* propagated, any or every disease that is in the blood. To the last moment they hardened themselves against conviction, and when unable any longer to deny it, they showed no humility, no confession of error, no abashment."

Professor Kranichfeld, of Berlin, gives his conclusions thus: "I too," he says, "have vaccinated my fourteen children at a time when I did not know how injurious it was. To-day I would resist the authorities and the police law."

But let us see how certain Americans have expressed themselves as to the matter. Prof. Alexander Wilder, M.D., editor of the *New York Medical Tribune*, says, in his pamphlet entitled "Vaccination a Medical Fallacy": "Vaccination is physiologically and morally wrong, and its advocates are inherently conscious of it, or else they would trust to argument and conviction." "The act of vaccination is simply the contamination of a patient's body with a blood poison. Its most fitting eulogy is found in the *New Testament*—Satan casting out Satan. The conclusion is inevitable; *it will not be done.*" He also says: "There is nothing in the nature or elements of vaccine pustule, or of the ferment of the body of the patient, which vaccination creates, to counteract small-pox tendencies, or to eradicate them. It is simply the outcome of a filthy disease. The idea of employing such an agency to purify the constitution from any poison is repugnant to the plainest principles of common sense. The act of vaccination is simply the contaminating of a patient's body with a blood poison."

Prof. Robert E. Gunn, M.D., Dean of the United States Medical College in New York, in his pamphlet entitled "Vaccination: Its Fallacies and Evils," says: "Vaccination has been made compulsory in our schools; Vaccinators have gone from house to house to vaccinate old and young, and the profession have enjoined the people to have recourse to repeated re-vaccination, and yet small-pox prevails; and the majority who suffer from it have been vaccinated."

Carl Spitzig, M.D., in his very scientific and elaborate article in the *St. Louis Clinical Record* for February and March, 1881,

and since reprinted in pamphlet form, entitled "Failure of Vaccination," closes his careful discussion of the matter as follows: "Now, in conclusion, in view of the pathological action of variola, and the danger and utter futility of vaccination above abundantly set forth, must not, then, its claimed "protection" against small-pox be regarded as vanity, and its continued practice a crime?"

In looking over the second Report of the State Board of Health, Lunacy and Charity, mentioned by Dr. Everett in his learned article, I found there the following pertinent testimony, which, as he did not cite it, I will here quote: "A French writer, Verde de Lisle, says, 'Vaccination has caused mental and physical degeneration of the human species, diminished men's stature, incapacitating them for the fatigues of military service, or even the exercise of dancing.'" Also, at the bottom of p. 189 in the same volume, appears this significant note: "In small-pox hospitals a majority of the patients can usually show more or less well marked scars or other evidences of vaccination." Which certainly shows that vaccination does not protect from small-pox.

One more witness shall close the testimony. Let Dr. R. K. Noyes, late resident surgeon to Boston City Hospital, take the stand. In his book entitled "On the Self Curability of Disease," published last year, on p. 42, he thus gives his opinion: "I believe vaccination has been the greatest universal delusion that has ensnared mankind within the last three centuries. It originated in fraud, ignorance and error. It is absurdly unscientific and impracticable. It has been promotive of very great evil, and I cannot accredit to it any good."

From the time when patient Job cried out, "Ye are all physicians of no value, ye are forgers of lies" (Job xiii: 4); from the time when Asa, King of Judah (ii Chronicles xvi: 12) for the cure of his disease, sought to the physicians, and as a consequence slept with his fathers and died; from the time when the woman with the issue of blood (Mark v. 25), who spent all her living upon physicians, and suffered many things from them, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse; to the time when, to relieve General Washington of the croup, they blistered and bled him to death; to the time when Charles Sumner and Louis Agassiz, each under their care and medicines, died, while subsequent autopsies disclosed a normal condition of their vital organs; to the time when English physicians quarrelled among themselves at the bedside

of the dying Beaconsfield; to the time when the chosen physicians and surgeons of the United States assembled around the sick-bed of President Garfield to extract from his body the assassin's bullet,—BLUNDERED,—and behold he died; have the services of doctors as a profession, or any school of them, been such as to make it just and desirable that their theories, prescriptions and practices should be authoritative and final over all other people, or entitle them to be the tribunal of last appeal on medical matters, or to hold any special privileges from the State? Their dogmatisms, their quarrels, their blunders, their jealousies, their cliques, their enmities, their inoculations, their feuds, their vaccinations and vivisections are notorious. Into the pleasant pastures and peaceful arenas of true science they have not yet entered. The idea of making perfect health a crime, and of punishing its possessors as criminals, because they will not permit themselves or their children to be diseased by the infusion into their veins of moistened putrid animal pus, is one which could not have originated anywhere except in the minds of medical and legislative quacks. What right has Dr. Everett or his fellow-practitioners to subject the bodies of myself and fellow-citizens to his lancet or scarificator, and the infusion into our bodies, of pus from a diseased heifer? All men in Massachusetts have an equal right with Dr. Everett to their respective religious opinions and practices. Why should they not all have an equal right with Dr. Everett to their respective medical opinions and practices? In a land of boasted freedom, have its citizens no individual rights which are secure from the invasions of legislators and doctors? Certain revolutions have taught and are teaching the would-be rulers that each and every man, woman and child have certain essential, inalienable, undying, NATURAL rights, which inhere in, and grow out of their constitutions as human beings. They are sacred from the touch of all persons, and ought especially to be kept unpolluted from the greedy grasp of priests, doctors and legislators. Whoever would encroach on them, the same are thieves and robbers.

The Constitution of Massachusetts declares that the end and purpose of government is to secure to *individuals* who compose the body-politic "the power of enjoying in safety and tranquility their natural rights and the blessings of life." Good health, if a person be so fortunate as to inherit it, or otherwise possess it, is a "natu-

ral right." One does not derive it from doctors or legislators. He possesses, and it is in, and of him, from the nature of his being. No right is more inherent in, or more essential to, a man in this work-a-day world than, good health. No one of "the blessings of life" is more valuable. Surely the Legislature has no rightful power to imperil that good health, by compelling its possessor to submit himself to the disputed theories and experiments of the doctors. The Constitution also declares that if "the property of an individual should be appropriated to public uses, he shall receive a reasonable compensation therefor." A man's good health is his property. It enables him to obtain a livelihood and give honor and support to the State. A man's body in Massachusetts is his property. Formerly, in the Southern States, many men's bodies were their master's property. Notwithstanding the late civil war, the idea of alien ownership in man, has not entirely disappeared. Even in Massachusetts, certain doctors are in the delusion that they are so far owners of the bodies of their neighbors, as to entitle them, under certain conditions, to vaccinate those bodies, with the compelled consent of their owners, as if unconstitutional and inhuman compulsory vaccination statutes could confer the right. If the Legislature, believing that universal vaccination is a public benefit, enact statutes compelling people to submit to it, and any of them be thereby injured, is not such person entitled to a reasonable compensation? How large, and what shall be the compensation to the innocent child, or the healthy man or woman, whose body has been poisoned with syphilis, or scrofula, or incipient consumption, diphtheria, cancer, tumor, erysipelas, ulcers, boils, or other diseases by the operation? It is not the legitimate business of the Legislature, to select, or to favor any one of the many existing medical systems and theories of the doctors, nor is it good policy, to attempt to coerce any one of the inhabitants, much less all the people, to take any particular one's medicines, or to submit to his practices; any more than it is its function to establish a particular religious system, and to compel the people's acceptance of it. Both one and the other are tyrannies, and perversions of honest legislation.

No! one of the ends and purposes of government in Massachusetts is to secure to *individuals* of the body-politic, the power of enjoying in safety and tranquility the preservation of good health, and the possession of their own bodies, free from the



jeopardy of the vaccine virus, the medicines, the pet theories, and other machinations of the many doctors that surround them. Long may that right be maintained and preserved from encroachment. The medical profession have never been agreed as to the efficacy of vaccination. Some doctors and some people believe that vaccination prevents small-pox; and other doctors and other people, equally intelligent, that it, like other unwholesome conditions of life, tends to produce small-pox and many other diseases. Not less stupendously absurd and unconstitutional, therefore, are the existing Statutes of Massachusetts, compelling vaccination, than would be Statutes universally prohibiting it; and if unconstitutional, they are void and of no legal effect, and no member of any School Committee is under obligation to obey, or to enforce them. Yet true State policy—that is, an honest respect for the natural rights, personal liberty, bodily health, and the morality of the people, require that the existing *Compulsory Vaccination Statutes* of Massachusetts should be repealed, as were the cruel witchcraft statutes, (enacted in a former day, to preserve the spiritual health of the people) at the earliest possible moment, leaving every person at liberty to be vaccinated, or not vaccinated, according as each one may be assured in his own mind. LET EVERY YOKE BE BROKEN AND THE OPPRESSED GO FREE.

ALFRED E. GILES.

Hyde Park, Nov. 9, 1881.

## CORROBORATIVE TESTIMONY.

W. J. COLLINS, M.D., LONDON.

"After occupying the position of Public Vaccinator for twenty years in one of the most populous metropolitan parishes, and having devoted twenty-five years to close study of the question, I have relinquished the practice of vaccination, with its emoluments, on the ground, that while it afforded no protection against small-pox, it was the frequent cause of dangerous and fatal diseases."

CONSTANTINE HERING, M.D.,  
PHILADELPHIA.

"I have more than once plainly seen, and often heard of, cases where children re-

mained ailing from the time of vaccination, who were previously in robust health."

J. EMERY CODERRE, M.D., PROFESSOR OF  
"MATERIA MEDICA," VICTORIA UNIVERSITY,  
AND FOR THIRTY YEARS PHYSICIAN AT  
HOTEL DIEU, MONTREAL.

"The idea of introducing into a healthy organism the virus of an inflammatory and gangrenous malady, in order to keep it from a disease which does not exist, is revolting to common sense."

"Now my suspicions become  
Firm convictions. My duties plain. Teach  
The people that—their sacrifice of infants  
To the vile superstition of vaccine  
Corruption is—viler than the sin of  
Israel offering their first-born to Baal."

## IMPORTANT TO SCHOOL COMMITTEES AND OTHER PERSONS.

If school committees, teachers, lawyers, and other citizens who see that the *Compulsory Vaccination Statutes* are Unconstitutional, and therefore are void and of no legal potency, will disregard them, as a prerequisite to the admission of unvaccinated children to the public schools, they will thereby prevent the blood poisoning of many innocents. Such action on their part will probably lead to a speedy repeal of the statutes, or to an authoritative exposition and nullification of them, by the Supreme Judicial Court of the State. Here in Massachusetts, where Samuel Adams, John Hancock, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Theodore D. Weld, and other noble patriots have contended for natural rights and for righteous personal liberty, there are doubtless many persons who believe, with Peter and the apostles, they must obey God rather than men. Such persons will not obey *Compulsory Vaccination Statutes*, as against the *natural* and equal rights of their neighbors, or to the harm of their children.





### Connecticut Eclectic Physicians Oppose Vaccination.

The Eclectic Medical Association held its semi-annual meeting at the Elliot House in New Haven on Monday, November 14th. The President, Dr. Edwin R. Ripley, of Unionville, occupied the chair.

The question of Vaccination was presented by Dr. L. S. Ludington, of New Britain, who had been appointed to support the practice. It was a half-hearted production, though humorous, for Dr. Ludington is an earnest, progressive man, and has convictions.

Dr. S. B. Munn, of Waterbury, reviewed the history of vaccination, and combatted the pretense that it would protect against small-pox. He declared that if a law should be passed to make medical men peculiarly responsible for its ill effects, no physician would ever vaccinate. He showed what these effects were. Vaccine virus induces a ferment in the blood, with an active tendency toward the formation of pus; erysipelas was liable to intervene. As for protection, there was none whatever. Jenner himself, after several patients had taken small-pox, declared that cow-pox was not a prophylactic against attack; but that virus from the heels of a diseased horse was the only safeguard.

Dr. Munn stated that he had observed cases where small-pox existed, in which the vaccinated were attacked, and the unvaccinated, though equally exposed, would escape. Indeed, the disease would seem to attack such, by preference.

Dr. Fisk, of Guilford, spoke of the liability to transmit other disorders with the vaccine virus. It was notorious, he said, that a large number of the animals slaughtered by butchers had diseased lungs and livers. The fact was carefully kept out of sight, but such is the case. Bovine virus taken from such animals would convey the other diseases with it. Scrofula and consumption are so propagated.

Dr. Pease, of Thomaston, said he had been employed in Government service in the army during the civil war. Part of his duty was to vaccinate. The soldiers would be drawn up in line and compelled to bare their arms for him to operate. Some of the sores thus produced were frightful. The arm would swell to inordinate dimensions, even endangering the life of many. Yet it kept off no pestilence; and he could declare, from his own experience and observation, that vaccination was the veriest humbug imaginable.

Dr. Ludington gave an instance in which leprosy had been communicated to the patient by this process. He cited cases where the same person had small-pox repeatedly; and affirmed his conviction that if variola could not prevent its own recurrence, it was futile to seek such prevention by other disorders.

The debate was participated in by others, and was very interesting. The president gave his experience, which also went to show the uselessness of vaccination as a prophylactic, and the utter impropriety of resorting to it on any other pretext.

The Association then adopted the following resolution by an unanimous vote:

*Resolved*, That the Eclectic Medical Association of Connecticut hereby declares its convictions against the practice of Vaccination, and all legislation making it compulsory; and asks the Legislatures of the several States to pass laws prohibiting Sanitary Boards, School Boards, and other local authorities, from making, and enforcing regulations for that purpose.

Massachusetts' compulsive-vaccination statutes, proposed by an allopathic doctor, and first enacted by the Know-nothing legislature of 1855, prohibit the admission of any child to the public schools, who has not been duly vaccinated. Such laws subject children to the risk of *erysipelas*, *scrofula* and *consumption*, (in no State is consumption more rife, or vaccination more universal, than in Massachusetts) or, by excluding them from the public schools, leave them to grow up in *ignorance*—a sad alternative. "The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel," *Proverbs xii. v. 10*. Surely these statutes should be repealed at the earliest possible moment, and every free man be at *liberty* to take the supposed benefits, or escape the alleged risks of vaccination, for himself and children, as he may think best, and not be subjected, as he now is, in a matter of life and death for himself and family, to compulsory vaccination, or to the uncertain and disputed dogmas of any school or sect of doctors. Compulsory medicine and compulsory religion are alike abhorrent to freemen. "Liberty is the one thing essential to the right development of individuals, and the real grandeur of nations."

A. E. G.

Hyde Park, Mass., Dec. 2, 1881.





## OPINIONS CONCERNING MEDICAL PRACTICE.

---

DR. JACOB BIGELOW, formerly President of the Massachusetts Medical Society, in his *Expositions of Rational Medicine*, says: "I am certain that the unbiassed opinion of most medical men of sound judgment and long experience is, that the amount of death and disease in the world would be less than it now is, *if all disease were left to itself.*"

"The Medical profession is based upon a huge mass of learned ignorance and assumption."—ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS.

"It is my conviction, the result of considerable investigation, that should intelligence be transmitted and proclaimed by some undisputed authority, that on the last day of December next, the entire Medical profession — except the departments of Dentistry, Surgery and Obstetrics — would 'positively make its last appearance' in the world, mankind, even with their present limited knowledge of the laws of health, yea, even with all their diseases and infirmities upon them, would straightway be immeasurably benefitted."—  
IV GREAT HARMONIA, p. 383.

DR. OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, Professor of Anatomy in the Medical School of Harvard University, in his *Border Lines of Knowledge*, says: "The disgrace of medicine has been that colossal system of self-deception, in obedience to which, mines have been emptied of their cankering minerals, the entrails of animals taxed for their impurities, the poison bags of reptiles drained of their venom, and all the inconceivable abominations thus obtained, thrust down the throats of human beings suffering from some want of organization, nourishment, or vital stimulation."

SIR JAMES CLARK, M.D., in his letter to Dr. James Jackson, quoted in Dr. O. W. Holmes' *Currents and Counter-currents in Medical Science*, writes: "As a physician advances in age, he generally, I think, places less confidence in the ordinary medical treatment than he did, not only during his early, but even his middle period of life."

